02-277

From:

Snsk8tr@cs.com

To: Date: Commissioner Adelstein Sun, May 4, 2003 12:33 PM

Subject:

reguation changes

Hello, my name is Mr. Chambers. I wish to express my concern over the FCC changes. In a free society we need diversity not centralized control over our sources of information. Please keep the regulations in place. Thank you

Rick Heitman

To: Date: Commissioner Adelstein Sun, May 4, 2003 12:34 PM

Subject:

Broadcast ownership rules

Dear Mr. Adelstein:

I urge you not to relax the broadcast ownership rules that protect American citizens from media monopolies.

These proposed changes would pave the way for giant media conglomerates to gain near-total control of radio and television news and information in communities across out nation. And many of the corporations that are now lobbing the FCC to relax these ownership rules already have a known track record in attempting to keep opposing viewpoints off the air.

The American people deserve to hear more than one point of view on important issues. Therefore, for the sake of our democracy and our freedom, I urge you to continue the broadcast ownership protections that, for decades, have helped to ensure a healthy political debate in our county.

Sincerely, Rick Heitman Wausau, Wisconsin 54401

LARKHE@aol.com

To:

Commissioner Adelstein

Date: Subject: Sun, May 4, 2003 12:41 PM Broadcast Ownership Rules

The Honorable Jonathan S. Adelstein, Commissioner:

Please do not relax broadcast ownership rules that protect American citizens from media monopolies.

As a proud American, and a Life Member of the National Rifle Association of America I believe in all of the Amendments to the U.S. Constitution.

I feel that media monopolies could endanger every American's First Amendment right of Free Speech. That would be a terrible thing to happen, even if my fellow Americans disagreed with my interpretation of our Second Amendment rights.

In your wisdom and loyalty to America, I hope you will not let that happen.

Thank you for taking the time to read this and consider my opinion.

Mr. Richard J. Rick 22 Oliver RD. Manchester, CT. 06040-2942

Jfarwill@aol.com

To:

Mike Powell, KathleenQ.Abernathykabernat@fcc.gov,

MichaelJ.Coppsmcopps@fcc.gov, KevinJ.Martinkjmweb@fcc.gov, JonathanS.Adelsteinjadelste@fcc.gov

Date:

Sun, May 4, 2003 12:44 PM

Subject:

FCC Vote

As a concerned citizen who has never - I repeat never - written to anyone about any political subject, I am terrified of the direction this country is headed.

Further deregulation by the FCC will only serve to solidify the corporate oligarchy that the republicans and their handlers so desire. Please do the right thing and keep the five major corporations from completing their monoply of our media.

Respectfully submitted,

Jeff Williams Oakland, CA

Denise Guilbault-Langworthy

To:

Commissioner Adelstein

Date:

Sun, May 4, 2003 12:51 PM

Subject:

Comments to the Commissioner

Denise Guilbault-Langworthy (queenjazz@aol.com) writes:

Dear Commisioner Adelstein,

I urge you to reconsider your strong push toward making the United States of America a "one voice nation." Your efforts to allow large corporations access to own up to 35% of the media is putting us on the road to ruin. Why can't you see that??? I don't want to live in a country where our news is edited to fit what the corporate world wants us to know. That is what you are allowing to occur.

Denise Guilbault-Langworthy 3060 Stratford Street Flint, MI 48504

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1 Remote host: 64.12.96.139

Remote IP address: 64.12.96.139

Con Wisniewski

To:

Kathleen Abernathy, Mike Powell, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner

Adelstein

Date: Subject: Sun, May 4, 2003 1:00 PM

impending rule change concerns

Gentlemen,

I wish to register my concerns regarding impending rule changes being contemplated by the FCC. In particular, I have read that within the next 30 days, it is highly possible that the current rules that regulate the media industry could be dramatically altered by the FCC. I am greatly concerned that if current anti-monopolistic regulations are relaxed, then large media corporations could gain control of the industry through acquisition and could strongly bias the flow of news and information towards their own corporate interests.

Any changes regarding these regulations should be openly brought to the general public's attention and a thorough public examination should take place. There should be no hints of secrecy or hidden agendas surrounding the altering of the current rules. Too much is at stake to do otherwise.

Greatly concerned,

Conrad Wisniewski 48102 Whitney Ct. Canton, Michigan 48187 cwisniewski239928MI@comcast.net From: DoctaSanPedro@aol.com
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sun, May 4, 2003 1:02 PM
Subject: .Concerning Micheal Copps.

To Commissioner Adelstien.

This letter is in response to seeing Micheal Copps on the t.v. show NOW on Sunday May 4th.

There is no way on earth that allowing corporations to own more than 35% of specific media markets can be good for the public. This is a slippery slope that can lead to one group of people deciding what the entire country should view and hear on the airwaves. Even ownership of one third of the market in this respect is frightening.

Common decency needs to be present on June 2nd when the vote is cast. Please do not let media giants grow and grow. If ignorance prevails, the quality of the media can only go down hill, and our minds will suffer. There is no way that allowing consolidation of power and influence can be good for the public.

DO NOT LET US DOWN

We need to keep the airwaves open and not let corporations start to monopolize them. The public needs to be helped against multi-trillionare mega empires. please do what is right

Sincerely, Richard Coffman Winfield, IL

D. Andrew Winston

To:

Commissioner Adelstein

Date:

Sun, May 4, 2003 1:15 PM

Subject:

Comments to the Commissioner

D. Andrew Winston (DAndrewLaw@earthlink.net) writes:

Dear Commissioner Adelstein:

I write to urge you to resist and oppose any additional de-regulation of the airwaves, specifically with respect to further conglomeration of radio and television outlets by further reducing the restrictions upon how many outlets one company may own or control in any one market.

Since de-regulation, Clear Channel increased the number of radio stations it owns from 40 to 1,225, 970 more than its closest competitor. That hardly bodes well for diversity in programming or viewpoints. Now I have become aware that the FCC is considering relaxing rules limiting the number of TV stations any company can own and prohibitions on media companies owning another conglomerate, thereby opening a Pandora's box of super-conglomerates. I believe such a move will be the death of true free speech in this country and instead incubate one monolithic political orthodoxy. I'm sure you'll agree that is in noone's best interest.

I urge you to resist any efforts to further loosen the safeguards currently in place.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

D. Andrew Winston Attorney at Law 595 Canyon Boulevard Boulder, Colorado 80302 303.440.9779 FAX: 303.444.7371

DAndrewLaw@earthlink.net

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1 Remote host: 209.245.5.6 Remote IP address: 209.245.5.6

Melanie Killinger-Vowell

To:

Commissioner Adelstein

Date: Subject: Sun, May 4, 2003 1:17 PM Comments to the Commissioner

Melanie Killinger-Vowell (dmvowell@aol.com) writes:

One of the 9-11 hijackers is alleged to have said that he hoped the terrible actions of that day would herald the beginning of the end of America. If the FCC relaxes media ownership rules it will be contributing to the decline of free and diverse speech in this country and the hijackers - wherever they are - will be laughing and applauding. Don't do it!

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1 Remote host: 198.81.26.139

Remote IP address: 198.81.26.139

Joel McManus

To: Date: Commissioner Adelstein Sun, May 4, 2003 1:28 PM

Subject:

Against mass media deregulation

Dear Commissioner Adelstein,

Hello. My name is Charles Joel McManus. I am a graduate student at the University of Wisconsin-Madison and consider myself to be a responsible, active citizen interested in preserving the freedoms granted to citizens of the United States under the Constitution. It has come to my attention that there will be a decision on June 2 about whether or not it is legal and just to allow any media companies to control large percentages of our local and national mass media. I urge you to vote against allowing this deregulation of our mass media for the following reasons.

First and foremost, deregulation and centralization of media will erode the ability for different voices and opinions to be made public. This threatens to destroy one of the foundations of our democratic society, free speech. For a recent example, I refer you to what has happened to Peter Arnett, the Pulitzer Prize winning journalist. Mr. Arnett was working for NBC and National Geographic covering our recent invasion of Iraq and made the "mistake" of expressing his opinion about the war publicly. For exercising his freedom of speech, Mr. Arnett was fired from both NBC and National Geographic assignments. NBC could not afford to allow an even slightly dissenting voice to be heard as they are driven by profits, not truth. Allowing mass media to consolidate erodes public access to voices and opinions that do not reinforce the status quo or make money for large corporations.

This brings me to the second reason for my position against deregulation of the mass media. Mass media is driven by profit and will therefore express whatever opinion allows them to make the most money. On television, radio, and in the printed press, this system stifles voices and opinions which make people question themselves, their government, and their society. Without questioning these things, people in this country will find it hard to become active, well-informed participants in our great Republic. We cannot allow profits to determine truth by exclusion of that which is unprofitable. Deregulation of our mass media will exacerbate an already large problem.

Thirdly, consolidation of mass media into large companies is anti-capitalist. As we both know, capitalism can only occur when a very large number of companies compete. Allowing some companies to grow very large and absorb the smaller ones, while often efficient, tends to kill competition as there are fewer competitors. As an American and a believer in capitalism, this is a very disturbing prospect for our mass media.

Finally, I ask you to imagine the long term effects of deregulation of the mass media. Imagine turning on your television and seeing several different channels with different faces all reading the same dialogues. Imagine finding the same song simultaneously on every radio station and the same article, word for word, in every newspaper. While this sounds extreme, this is likely what would happen from deregulation of the mass media. This very well could be the country that our children and grandchildren inherit. In this world, dissenting opinions will have no chance of finding

expression, as they will be bleached out by the incessant, loud, surrounding voice of a few companies hell-bent on making profits. I hope that you are as disturbed by the idea as I am.

I urge you to consider my opinions and help protect freedom of speech in this great country of ours by opposing deregulation of the mass media on June 2 of this year.

Sincerely, Charles Joel McManus 408 W. Mifflin St. #4 Madison, WI 53703.

Louise Young

To: Date: Commissioner Adelstein Sun, May 4, 2003 1:28 PM

Subject:

Support continued regulation on June 2, 2003

Dear Commissioner Adelstein.

I am a citizen concerned about the FCC's upcoming decision regarding the deregulation of media ownership. Already consolidation of radio and television stations, and merging of newspapers has taken the local out of local news.

Though private ownership is part of our country's great heritage of creating opportunity for personal success, ownership of the airways is public. Media owners are using space owned by all of us, and if the FCC deregulates further, the public will risk having little choice in what we see on TV, hear on the radio, and read in the papers.

Please preserve what we have left of media diversity. In our country today, we need to hear many voices and read many stories to keep alive our freedom of choice in a democracy.

Yours sincerely,

Louise Young

43300 Airport Rd.

Little River, CA 95456

forden m. hughes

To:

Commissioner Adelstein

Date:

Sun, May 4, 2003 1:29 PM

Subject:

Comments to the Commissioner

forden m. hughes (fordenh@aol.com) writes:

Please allow public testimony before the June 2, 2003 hearing re. commercial broader purchasing of media sources.

Thank You.

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1 Remote host: 68.69.105.179

Remote IP address: 68.69.105.179

SMMTVISTA@aol.com

To:

Mike Powell, Commissioner Adelstein, KM KJMWEB, Michael Copps

Date: Subject: Sun, May 4, 2003 1:39 PM Broadcast Ownership Rules

Dear Sir:

I think it would be un-American to relax the broadcast ownership rules that protect the American public from the giant media conglomerates! To allow a small number of corporations or individuals to have a virtual monopoly of the news on radio, television, and newspapers should be unconstitutional: I therefore urge you not to change the existing rules -- the American people deserve to hear more than one point of view on important issues.

For the sake of our democracy and our freedom, I urge you to continue the broadcast protections that have helped to insure a healthy political debate in this country for decades.

Thank you.

Spencer Mould Lexington, Va. 24450-3918

OGle802824@aol.com

To:

Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner

Adelstein

Date: Subject: Sun, May 4, 2003 1:40 PM

Broadcast Ownership Rules

Dear Sir:

I urge you not to relax the broadcast ownership rules that protect American citizens from media monopolies. This is unfairly being slipped over the American public without their knowledge.

These proposed changes would pave the way for giant media conglomerates to gain near-total control of radio and television news and information in communities across our nation. And many of the corporations that are now lobbying the FCC to relax these ownership rules already have a known track record in attempting to keep opposing viewpoints off the air.

The American people deserve to hear more than one point of view on important issues. Therefore, for the sake of our democracy and our freedom, I urge you to continue the broadcast ownership protections that, for decades, have helped to ensure a healthy political debate in our country.

Sincerely,

Owen C. Gleaves Mount Juliet, Tennessee 37122-5709

Panettim@cs.com

To:

Mike Powell

Date:

Sun, May 4, 2003 1:51 PM

Subject:

Proposed changes to FCC code

To Commissioner Powell and Committee Members:

I am deeply concerned at the proposed changes to our rules regulating ownership and consolidation of media. While mergers may improve the bottom lines of some corporations, your job is to preserve the airways for the benefit and use of the American public. We need more public access, not less.

The fact that not one commercial station has aired a discussion of the proposals illustrates the current situation nicely: networks will not program ideas that run counter to corporate interests. How can a democracy function without full and open airing of all ideas? Primary among these, surely, are what our government agencies are proposing.

As to your allegations that the existing rules are old and out of date, may I remind you that the U.S. Constitution is 200 years old . No one is claiming that it is our of date.

Please use your commission's valuable time to think of ways our airways can be used to promote democracy, such as providing free air time to our national and local candidates, forums, debates, etc. This could begin to address the terrible corruption surrounding campaign financing and increase voter participation.

We look to this commission to redress the current dangerous state of affairs. Our concern is not profits for media conglomerates, but the preservation of a healthy democracy. Thank you for your attention and please remember your duty to our citizens.

Very truly yours Marjory Panetti

Christina Bradley

To:

Commissioner Adelstein

Date:

Sun, May 4, 2003 1:53 PM

Subject:

Comments to the Commissioner

Christina Bradley (MusicaMarin@netscape.net) writes:

Dear Commissioner Adelstein:

I am in agreement with your positions regarding deregulation. Below please find a copy of the e-mail I have just sent to your fellow Commissioners. Thank you for arging on behalf of those of us with "no voice".

Sincerely, Christina Bradley

TEXT OF E-MAIL SENT TO FCC CHAIRMAN AND COMMISSIONERS

I agree with the observations quoted below from an interview on NOW with Bill Moyers and Barry Diller.

"MOYERS: You mentioned the Telecommunications Act of 1996. The chairman of the FCC, the Federal Communications Commission, said at that time and he was a Democrat here's what he said: "The new law is intended to begin the era of genuine competition." And you say just the opposite has (happened) . . .

DILLER: What happened is that instead of the competition that was supposed to get more voices and all of those things, this dangerous oligopoly reconstituted itself in ways that nobody thought would happen at the time. ... Five, ten years ago there were thousands and thousands of cable operators serving their local communities. Now, there are three big ones and three mid-size ones. And no one else essentially.

MOYERS: And the consequence is?

DILLER: The consequences have to be that when you get that kind of size it has to restrain the ability of any new player. It gives them such buying power. It gives them such overwhelming power in the marketplace that everyone has to do essentially what they say."

Clear Channel has gone from 40 radio stations to over 1200 stations. Local news is getting squeezed out in favor of regurgitated pap decreed from "on high" through chains of command. Media content is completely determined by corporate execs in glass offices. Just ask the musicians who can't their songs on local channels.

We just went through a dirty, stinking, messy war. But if you watched American media, you'd think only American and British soldiers suffered casualties and the only child injured was poor little Ali with his lack of arms.

You'd also think that tens of thousands of missing Iraqi soldiers just "melted away". Well, yes, I guess they did, after a fashion. A body does tend to dismember and "melt away" when subjected to cluster bombs, MOABs, missile fires, bunker busters, etc. Do you think the corporate-sponsored media told the "whole" story? But of course not. In your heart of hearts you know the truth hasn't begun to come out about the war.

I am completely, adamantly, totally opposed to doing to visual media what's already happened in radio. Take it from a Californian who had to pay \$300 a month for energy deregulation during the Enron-created crisis, the same lie is being perpetuated about deregulation of the media, that somehow it will lead to more competition. Hah! If you believe that, I've got a bridge to sell you in Brooklyn!

Sincerely, Christina Bradley

To:

Panettim@cs.com Commissioner Adelstein

Date:

Subject:

Sun, May 4, 2003 1:54 PM Fwd: Proposed changes to FCC code

Brent Hymer

To:

Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, KM KJMWEB, Michael Copps, Commissioner

Adelstein

Date:

Sun, May 4, 2003 2:13 PM

Subject:

Please don't loosen or eliminate rules

Gentlemen,

It is my understanding that the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) is considering relaxing or getting rid of rules to allow much more media concentration. Please don't do it!

Now, assuming we all live in the same country, you are all well aware of Telecommunications Act of 1996 and the unprecedented consolidation that resulted from this irresponsible legislation. It's well past time to reign in corporate consolidation. Need I remind you that the FCC exists to protect the public, not corporations? Frankly, the FCC is failing at its most crucial duty. As you prepare to make important decisions regarding FCC rules, please, remember whose interests you are supposed to be looking out for.

Sincerely,

Brent Hymer

Burlington, MA 781-272-7784

CC: FCC FCCINFO, ted_Kennedy@Kennedy.senate.gov, John_Tierney@Tierney.house.gov, john_kerry@kerry.senate.gov, president@whitehouse.gov, vice.president@whitehouse.gov

Morris D Sullivan

To:

Commissioner Adelstein

Date:

Sun, May 4, 2003 2:32 PM

Subject:

Broadcast Ownership Rules

Dear Mr. Adelstein,

I urge you NOT to relax the broadcast ownership rules that protect American citizens from media monopolies. These proposed changes would pave the way for giant media conglomerates to gain near-total control of radio and television news and information in communities across our nation. Also, many of the corporations that are now lobbying the FCC to relax these ownership rules already have a known track record in attempting to keep opposing viewpoints off the air.

The American people deserve to hear more than one point of view on important issues. Therefore, for the sake of our democracy and our freedom, I urge you to continue the broadcast ownership protections that, for decades, have helped to ensure a political debate in our country.

Sincerely,

Morris D. Sullivan 6018 Burnt Knob Rd. Murfreesboro, TN 37129-2628

James Nimmo

To:

Commissioner Adelstein Sun, May 4, 2003 2:34 PM

Date: Subject:

Comments to the Commissioner

James Nimmo (violadamore2@yahoo.com) writes:

Mr. Adelstein:

American citizens need a MORE diverse ownership of the commercial media, NOT a concentrated oligarchy of corporate big-timers. It is extremely important for the future of our democracy. Some 90% of the media is already in the hands of about 7 large conglomerates. Can you remember the REAL meaning of the word "diversity" before the Republicans dirtied it along with the word "liberal"?

James Nimmo 2406 MW 59th Street Oklahoma City, OK 73112-7348

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1 Remote host: 156.110.24.142 Remote IP address: 156.110.24.142

ChasNoulle@aol.com

To:

Commissioner Adelstein Sun, May 4, 2003 2:35 PM

Date: Subject:

Broadcast Rules

I urge you NOT to relax the broadcast ownership rules that protect American citizens from media monopolies.

If the proposed "broadcast ownership rules" are adopted, independent voices in cities across the Unite States could be snuffed out by huge media corporations.

Whole communities, and even whole states and regions, could be dominated by one media company which could decide which viewpoints to allow on the air and which to censor.

The big media conglomerates have in the past used their power to keep opposing viewpoints off the air. These proposed rule changes would give them far greater power to keep opposing views off the air and out of the newspapers.

Many of the corporations that are fighting for these rule changes, including media giants Viacom/CBS and Disney/ABC, are precisely the same companies that have tried in the past to keep other viewpoints off the air.

The American people deserve to hear more than one point of view on important issues. Therefore, for the sake of our democracy and our freedom, I urge you to continue the broadcast ownership protections that, for decades, have helped to ensure a healthy political debate in our country.

Sincerely,

Charles A. Noullet, Sr., Lacombe, LA

HELEN JEWELL

To:

Mike Powell

Date:

Sun, May 4, 2003 2:41 PM

Subject:

FCC DECISION IN JUNE

I UNDERSTAND THAT THE FCC WILL BE MAKING A DECISION NEXT MONTH THAT WILL ALLOW COMPANIES TO OWN MORE THAN THE PRESENT LIMIT OF TV, RADIO AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS THAN THEY PRESENTLY CAN. WE CANNOT LET A FEW PEOPLE BE IN CONTROL OF OUR MOST IMPORTANT FREEDOM.—TO HEAR AND SEE THE TRUTH. PLEASE, FOR THE SAKE OF OUR COUNTRIES FREEDOM OF SPEECH, DO NOT ALLOW THIS TO HAPPEN. THE PUBLIC DOES CARE. MRS. DAVID F. JEWELL (HELEN)

RUSSO707@aol.com

To:

Mike Powell

Date:

Sun, May 4, 2003 2:57 PM

Subject:

Media Owernship(June 2nd Vote)

As a citizen of this country along with my family are very concerned about the proposed change in the FCC rules and regulations that will be decided for the up and coming vote on June 2nd that will drastically effect the way the people of this country receive their information.

The main concern is that there is not enough information about what is exactly being voted on, what are the details of the vote and the broad configuartion of what the new system will be.

I beleive more hearings along with further disclosure and with citizen partisapation needs to take place in a matter were the majority of the public is aware of the full scope and consequences of this major vote.

I have viewed the ideas suggested which have been expressed by Commissioner Michael J. Copps and concur with his proposals. Especially the part with keeping in concideration that the air waves are the people's property and any decision should be based on the interests of the citizens.

I hope that you rethink your decision not to hold hearings on this matter and listen to the other members on the board to come to a sound conclusion that benefits all who will be effected by your decisions.

Sincerely, Concerned Citizens: Dawn Russo Barbara Wise 707 Marigold Drive Lady Lake FL 32159

CC:

Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, klmweb@fcc.gov, jadlste@fcc.gov

Abigail van Alyn Booraem

To:

Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein

Date:

Sun, May 4, 2003 3:01 PM

Subject:

Media concentration/deregulation

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing in great alarm, to ask you to put on the brakes!

I strongly oppose any action that would further consolidate the power of the media in corporate hands. Further, I support Commissioner Copps in his efforts to open this question (the question: "In a democracy, who owns the airwaves?") to public debate and comment.

Fox News everywhere, all the time? No thank you!!

Abigail van Alyn Booraem

Abigail Van Alyn INTEGRAL COACHING Programs for Professional and Personal Mastery www.abigailvanalyn.com

510-845-0648 phone 510-845-2442 fax

"If success or failure of this planet and of human beings depended on how I am and what I do... How would I be?
What would I do?"

R. Buckminster Fuller